

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXI, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1928

WHOLE No. 579



ESSEDUM BRITANNICUM

The Art of Reading Latin

What better way to cultivate the art of reading Latin easily and well than to start early and keep it up while learning grammar and syntax? Why wait until all the rules are mastered? Just as soon as the first declension and the first conjugation are learned, simple stories can be read which will enlarge the vocabulary and encourage a feeling of reality in Latin as a living rather than a dead language.

The ELEMENTARY LATIN CLASSICS

offer eight readers of increasing difficulty for the first two years of Latin

Sonnenschein: ORA MARITIMA

Reed: JULIA
CAMILLA

Morton: LEGENDS OF GODS AND HEROES

Nall: THE SEVEN KINGS OF ROME

Caesar's HELVETIAN WAR

Caesar's INVASION OF BRITAIN

Wilkinson: LEGENDS OF ANCIENT ROME

All are illustrated. The above illustration is from ORA MARITIMA

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Rolling Back The Years

In order to make the pupil interested in the study of Latin, and to give him an incentive to further study,

THE PLACE TEXTBOOKS

treat Latin like a present-day language and the Romans as if they were actually living to-day.

This makes the past seem like the present, and gives a freshness and vitality to the study that greatly interest the pupil and urge him on.

Place's Beginning Latin \$1.40 Place's Second Year Latin \$1.68
Key to Each Book

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

Columbia University in the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION

July 9 to August 17, 1928

Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

GREEK

Elementary Course	(= Entrance Greek a) Professor Eugene Tavenner	Herodotus	Professor Clinton W. Keyes
Xenophon	(= Entrance Greek b) Professor Eugene Tavenner	Tragedy	Professor La Rue Van Hook
		Greek Life and Thought	Professor La Rue Van Hook

LATIN

Elementary Course	(For Beginners) Mr. Irving C. Demarest	Odes of Horace	(College Course) Mr. Moses Hadas
Caesar, Gallic War	(= Entrance Latin 3) Professor Clinton W. Keyes	Prose Composition	(Advanced College Course) Mr. Moses Hadas
Vergil, Aeneid	(= Entrance Latin 5) Mr. Irving C. Demarest	Roman Literature of the Early Empire	Professor Marbury B. Ogle
Cicero: Selected Orations	(= Entrance Latin 4) Mr. Paul R. Hays	Vergil, Aeneid	(Advanced Course) Professor Nelson G. McCrea
Prose Composition	(= Entrance Latin 6) Mr. Paul R. Hays	Roman Lyric and Elegiac Poetry	Professor Marbury B. Ogle
Prose Composition	(For Teachers) Professor Hubert M. Potat	Roman Philosophy	Professor Hubert M. Potat
Livy	(College Course) Professor Frank H. Cowles	Prose Composition	(For the A.M. degree) Professor Nelson G. McCrea
		Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil	Professor Frank H. Cowles

ANCIENT HISTORY

Ancient History	Professor Herbert C. Holdridge	Roman Empire	Professor Albert T. Olmstead
-----------------	--------------------------------	--------------	------------------------------

PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For Announcement of the 1928 Summer Session, Address the Secretary of
Columbia University, New York City

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXI, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1928

WHOLE NO. 579

A MONUMENT TO PROFESSOR KELSEY

Latin and Greek in American Education, with Symposia on the Value of Humanistic Studies. Edited by Francis W. Kelsey. Revised Edition. New York: The Macmillan Company (1927). Pp. xiii + 360.

IN HONOREM VIRI QUI DE REBUS CLASSICIS DE-
QUE OMNIBUS QUI EAS RES VEL DILIGUNT VEL
DILIGERE DEBENT BENE, IMMO VERE OPTIME
MERUIT HAEC VERBA SCRIPTA SUNT

The first edition of the volume entitled Latin and Greek in American Education, Edited by Professor Francis W. Kelsey, was published in 1911 (New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. x + 396). By invitation I reviewed the volume in the Educational Review 42.524-528 (December, 1911). By permission I reprinted the review, with considerable modifications and additions, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.89-90, 97-98 (January 20, 27, 1912). "The book", I said (5.89), "is of such importance that it cannot receive too much notice".

For some time the volume has been out of print. Repeated inquiries for copies of the book led, finally, to its republication, in a slightly modified form. The new version, a work of *pietas*, is edited by two colleagues of Professor Kelsey, Professor Henry A. Sanders and Dr. Eugene S. McCartney. Professor Sanders is well known for his work on the Freer Manuscripts. Dr. McCartney is Editor of the University of Michigan Publications, Humanistic Series, of which this volume forms a part. His contributions to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY have been numerous and of high value.

The contents of the original volume may be given in brief as follows: Chapters I-III, Francis W. Kelsey. The Present Position of Latin and Greek (1-16), The Value of Latin and Greek as Educational Instruments (17-39), Latin and Greek in Our Courses of Study (40-58); IV. The Nature of Culture Studies, R. M. Wenley, (59-81); Seven Symposia: I. Medicine, three papers (83-98), II. Engineering, four papers (99-120), III. Law, six papers (121-153), IV. Theology, five papers (154-209), V. Practical Affairs, five papers (210-259); the first 'paper' consists of three letters, from James Bryce, James Loeb, and William Sloane), VI. The New Education, three papers (260-343), VII. Formal Discipline, three papers (344-396).

The volume contained no index. Nor does the revised edition present an index.

Professor Kelsey's volume antedated by nearly six years the great conference on the value of the Classics that was held at Princeton, under the guidance of Professor Andrew F. West, on June 2, 1917. The results of that conference were, as is well known, published in a

volume entitled Value of the Classics (Princeton University Press, 1917. Pp. vii + 396. See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 11.74, 156). Of the Symposia reported in Professor Kelsey's volume I wrote as follows in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.89:

... Then comes a report of seven Symposia, held, all save the last, in 1905-1910 at the University of Michigan, as part of the Classical Conferences which for more than a dozen years have been held there annually in connection with the meetings of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club. The seventh Symposium, consisting of three papers championing Formal Discipline (344-396), is not self-evidently a part of any Classical Conference, and has no direct connection with the Classics. From page 24, however, one may infer that it was included because in various places in this book emphasis is laid on the disciplinary value of classical study; since some important authorities on psychology have denied in toto the possibility of formal discipline, it seemed worth while, no doubt, to prove a possibility which, to the layman, is obvious and axiomatic.

In a footnote I added the following:

Since the above words were written Professor Kelsey has informed me that the papers on Formal Discipline were in fact called forth by requests of classical men and that they were really counted as part of the conference programme. "In the western institutions", he continues, "the attack on the Classics has been largely directed from the point of view controverted in this Symposium".

I may note here that in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.113-114, 121-122 (February 6, 13, 1915) I discussed a volume entitled Latin and Greek in Education, which consisted of articles by representative members of the Faculty of the University of Colorado expressing their conceptions of the value of the study of Greek and Latin as part of one's preparation for higher education and for life. I gave special attention (113-114) to a paper by Professor Lawrence W. Cole, of the Department of Psychology, who vigorously championed the doctrine of formal discipline in general and the disciplinary value of the study of the Classics in particular.

The Conferences at which the Michigan Symposia were held were, *nisi fallor*, largely the outcome of Professor Kelsey's fertile mind and indefatigable energy. The first of the Symposia, held in 1905, antedates by twelve years the Princeton Conference, to which reference was made above, and antedates by thirteen or fourteen years the establishment of the American Classical League. The first Symposium antedated by eight years the publication of the volume entitled The Relation of Latin to Practical Life: Concrete Illustrations in the Form of an Exhibit, by Frances E. Sabin, assisted by Laura B. Woodruff (University of Chicago Press, 1913. Pp. x + 126). When the record of American classical education comes to be written adequately, the name and the works of Professor Kelsey will figure largely in that record. In so far

as there is value at all in studies of the Value of the Classics, and in Classical Conferences, Professor Kelsey did far more than any other one man has done to bring out that value. He was a pioneer; in a difficult time he blazed the way that others, in ever-increasing number, have since found it relatively easy to follow. To Professor Kelsey's work in this general field Horace's words well apply (Epistulae 1.2.40), *Dimidium facti qui coepit habet*....

Professor Kelsey died on May 14, 1927, while the Revised Edition of his volume, the work here under discussion, was in press. It is but fair to his memory to reproduce here, almost *in toto*, the Preface to the volume, by Messrs. Sanders and McCartney:

... It was his intention to rewrite entirely the first three chapters, but the pressure of other duties of an unusually active life prevented the accomplishment of his plans. This is especially to be regretted since the World War made great changes in the status of classical studies. Professor Kelsey's collection of material plainly indicates that he intended to bring up to date his chapter on "Greek in the High School and the Question of the Supply of Candidates for the Ministry" (pages 186-208 of the original edition), which was almost entirely statistical in character. In view of the greatly altered conditions of to-day the present editors feel that in omitting it they are carrying out what would have been Professor Kelsey's wishes. A short paper (pages 208-209) containing comments inspired by Professor Kelsey's chapter has likewise been omitted.

Professor Paul Shorey's contribution, "The Case for the Classics," has been brought up to date. Otherwise, with the exception of a very few minor changes, the second edition is the same as the first.

It will, I feel sure, appear presently that the material covered by the words "Professor Paul Shorey's contribution... has been brought up to date", is of great value, and would of itself supply material for a notice as long as the present notice of the Revised Edition as a whole.

To Dr. R. M. Wenley¹, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan, lovers of the Classics in this Country owe a profound debt of gratitude for his valiant championing of the cause of the Classics. If all proponents of subjects other than the Classics were themselves men of culture, as Professor Wenley is, the cause of the Classics would have nothing to fear: that cause would at least receive a sympathetic hearing and fair play. Since not every one has access to a copy of Volume 5 of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, either in his own library or in that of a nearby College or University, I reproduce here what I said about Professor Wenley's article in the volume under review (5.97):

To my mind one of the very best papers in the book is Professor Wenley's on *The Nature of Culture Studies*. It is less dazzling than Professor Shorey's article, *The Case for the Classics* (303-343), and it is not furnished, as Professor Shorey's paper is, with an elaborate array of footnotes giving the fullest references to the vast controversial literature of which the Classics have been the theme (the best published bibliography, by the way, on the subject), but it is everywhere concrete, directly suggestive and stimulating, wholly logical and coherent. Culture studies, says Professor Wenley, link man

principally with the past; their roots strike deep into history. "Rome attached the glorious heritage of centuries; Carthage, Syracuse, Athens, Thebes, Sparta, Alexandria, Jerusalem, were swallowed successively. Then she proceeded to annex the hopes of the future—Gaul, Spain, Germany, Britain" (63). We cannot, therefore, rid ourselves of Rome, try as we may.... "when we gaze out upon the past, the petty sloughs away, we are left alone with the spacious things that endowed life with dignity and gifted it with permanent worth. In this wonderful disappearance of the temporary the central meaning of cultural studies, like their present efficacy, finds impregnable shelter" (66). Education consists not in what is acquired, but in the manner of acquisition and all that it implies. Hence the studies in which average attainment is least readily elicited by purely mechanical means offer the processes best calculated to bring educational results. Again, culture studies demand a certain personal detachment that makes for individuality, "the one criminal omission of our contemporary <educational> system", by compelling a man to cut loose from things immediately present to sense, to prepare for larger relations, to view detail as a means to a distant end, to acquire mastery for its own all sufficing sake (71). On pages 72 ff. there is an admirable presentation of the intellectual processes called into play by the task of translating a Latin sentence and of the unequivocal demand which Latin makes upon absolute accuracy of intellectual process; nowhere have I seen this thought better presented. In this demand, the author urges, lies the efficacy of Latin as an instrument of education. In culture studies, then, we have the discipline necessary to thought, and, as a result of the material employed, an introduction to the great things of life, freed by the lapse of time from all pettiness (75).

To two papers in Symposium VI special attention must be called. One, entitled *The Classics in European Education* (260-282; Revised Edition, 213-231), is by Professor E. K. Rand, of Harvard University. Of that I wrote as follows (5.98):

... Though professedly only historical, aiming to show to what extent and in what manner the Classics have been (wrongly and rightly) studied, the paper gives a fine presentation of the claims of the Classics to a consideration even to-day in every scheme of education, because everywhere Professor Rand makes it clear that "the true progress of humanism, which is nothing but the ancient program revived, has always pointed men to the treasured ideals of the past, and inspired them to action in the present" (282)....

The other paper in Symposium VI to which reference was made above is a paper by Professor Paul Shorey, *The Case for the Classics* (Revised Edition, 249-314). The paper is in its author's most brilliant vein. The arguments which have been advanced against the study of the Classics are considered, and the claims of Latin and Greek are warmly urged. Without fear or favor, Professor Shorey discusses papers both of defenders and assailants of the Classics (among the latter is the late Charles W. Eliot, long President of Harvard University). With sham arguments by members of either group Professor Shorey has no patience. Nowhere else can one find so complete a bibliography of the discussion of these subjects (the nearest approach to Professor Shorey's work here is to be found in the Indexes to *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, under the caption *Value of the Classics*: see Indexes, to Volume I-XVI, 90-93, to XVII, 225, to XVIII, 224, to XIX, 253, to XX, 237. Incidental remarks on the value of the

¹Professor Wenley's volume, *Stoicism and Its Influence*, was reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 20.24-25.

Classics are to be found, also, in many of the articles in those Indexes listed under the captions, Teaching of Greek and Latin, Teaching <and Study> of Greek and Latin: see Index to Volumes I-XVI, 81-87 (13 solid columns of articles that appeared in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, October, 1907, to May, 1923); Index to XVII, 224, to XVIII, 224, to XIX, 252-253, to XX, 237. Verily, there is nothing new to be said on the theme of the value of the Classics.

The statement in the Preface to the Revised Edition that "Professor Paul Shorey's contribution, 'The Case for the Classics,' has been brought up to date" is not quite as clear as it might be. It is clarified by Professor Shorey thus (284):

A better writer could doubtless improve the rhetoric of "The Case for the Classics" and a more industrious reader² could indefinitely enlarge its bibliography. But after thirteen years I find nothing to change in the choice of topics and issues or in the arguments, fairly taken in their context, by which they are developed. I, therefore, leave the paper in its original shape, with a few additions to the footnotes, and reserve further comment for this supplement.

The new matter covers thirty-three pages (281-314). On pages 281-283 Professor Shorey writes as follows:

Never has the eternal debate been more animated than in the last thirteen years, and if bibliographical completeness was beyond my reach in 1912, it is still less desirable or practicable now. All I shall attempt in this supplement is to sketch the course that the argument has taken, give some account of my own further contributions to the subject, call attention to the more important books and pamphlets which have come to my notice, and put the student in the way of finding others.

While I apologize in advance for omissions or oversights they will not matter much. On so well-worn a theme *il n'y a pas de livre nécessaire*. Nearly all essential points are already made by Huxley, Arnold, John Stuart Mill, and Gildersleeve, to go no further back.

There is probably no essay whose ideas the student cannot find elsewhere and hundreds of those recorded in perfunctory bibliographies contain nothing that has not been better said scores of times.

To the last sentence (paragraph) I say Amen! Professor Shorey's paper itself will supply to the ambitious teacher of the Classics material to occupy all his spare hours for the next ten or twenty years. Every teacher of Latin and Greek should own this book. After he buys it, he should never again ask where he can find an article on the value of the Classics or ask to have an article on that theme published in any Classical (or other) periodical.

I should like to have every reader of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest a passage on pages 289-290. The passage was called forth by the Lincoln School, in New York City, an "experiment" in education (!) in which the teaching and the study of Latin and Greek find no part. Yet, to my mind, what Professor Shorey says applies, in large part, to the enthusiastic reports of new methods, new ways of "vitalizing" the Classics, or the study of the Classics, of which one hears so much from time to time, for a little while, till the new way fades into the dark, as so many others before it had faded.

²Where is such a person to be found?

Professor Shorey plainly had in mind such enthusiastic accounts of "new" methods, but, busied with such a shining mark as the Lincoln School, he did not make, in full, the application of his thought to method in the teaching of Latin itself. The passage runs as follows³:

The argument drawn from the Lincoln school belongs in short to a type which I have been in the habit of designating to myself as the 'fallacy of idealizing description'. The most elementary example of this is the picture of pretty children in interesting attitudes that accompany popular expositions of the Gary or Montessori system or illustrate Dewey's *Schools of the Future*. What mother can resist the emotion of conviction that the contemplation of such carefree happy infancy inspires? It is precisely the psychology of the gigantic bill board advertisements of 'milk from contented cows.' How can you distrust the contents of the can when you have seen the purple cows grazing? And indeed the connection is very close between the psychology of the new education and the psychology of advertising.

In somewhat less obvious fashion the entire literature of 'how Gertrude teaches her children,' and the endless stream of articles explaining how I found a better way to teach Caesar exemplify the same psychology....

I have no desire to suppress this literature.... The enthusiasm is good for the author and for any other teacher to whom it can be effectively communicated. And every tangible suggestion as to methods of teaching should be weighed and estimated for what it may be proved to be worth. But the uncritical acceptance of the founder's enthusiasm or the audience's sympathy with his idealizing descriptions and prophecies as confirmation of his particular educational theories or hobbies is one of the most widespread and pernicious fallacies of modern educational discussion. There is no necessary or probable connection. On the contrary, in proportion as the enthusiasm or the personal ambition of such a founder or the exceptional resources at his command enable him to make a better school for a selected group of children, is its significance as a scientific and crucial experiment on the curriculum diminished. The teaching of the world is and must remain largely wholesale task-work, a gigantic chore. The defects are mostly the limitations of the average man in power of sustained enthusiasm, self-sacrificing devotion and intelligence.... The exceptional school that in the first flush of enthusiasm or ambition overcomes these obstacles may afford helpful hints for

³I gave these views of Professor Shorey at some length, with exact quotations, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 12, 33-34 (in the course of a paper entitled Dr. Flexner's Critics, which is to be found on pages 10-11, 18-19, 25-26, 33-35). I deliberately quote here again Professor Shorey's remarks, for various reasons. First, I feel sure that, though all teachers of Latin and Greek ought to buy the book under discussion and ought then to cease clamoring for 'practical articles' in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY and The Classical Journal on the value of the Classics, they will not do either of these two all-important things. Secondly, I feel, most strongly, that the one salvation for the teaching of the Classics lies in teachers who are, first, real men and real women, secondly, rich in knowledge of Latin and Greek, thirdly, convinced that the study of Latin and Greek themselves is of far more value than study of the value of the Classics or study of methods of teaching the Classics (of what value is study of methods of teaching a given subject if one is without real knowledge of the subject?). As noted above, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY has presented an imposing array of valuable articles on the value of the Classics and the teaching of Latin and Greek. Now that the Revised Edition of Latin and Greek in American Education is at hand, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY will feel itself even more free than it has in the past four or five years to devote its space rather to papers which are *practical* in the truest sense of that much abused term, practical in that they open up to men and to women who are willing to be profited things that were not dreamed of in their philosophy, and so, adding to their knowledge of the Classics, will do far more to make them good teachers of the Classics than articles on the value of the Classics or the teaching of the Classics which do not even predicate a knowledge of Latin and Greek as a *sine qua non* (there have been far too many such articles on the teaching of Latin and Greek, especially in the High School).

combating them elsewhere, but its very success in this respect invalidates its testimony to the superiority of the particular curriculum of studies that its founder favors....

Another passage that should be carefully pondered by all true lovers of the Classics is to be found on pages 301-302. It deals with the volume mentioned above, *The Value of the Classics*, which resulted from the Princeton Conference of June 2, 1917:

The interest of the volume would not be impaired by the frank recognition that the arguments from testimonials and statistics, however suggestive, are not for opponents conclusive. The testimonials, collected by Dean West, are extremely impressive. But some of them are doubtless expressions of little more than good nature, and it is always open to an opponent to argue that equally strong testimonials could be obtained for the educational value of any other great subject of human concern.... The interpretation of educational statistics is far from being a science. It is rarely possible to isolate the one cause that contributes most to any observed educational result.

In a footnote, however, Professor Shorey adds (302), "...If anything is statistically certain, it is that even a little Latin tends to improve the English of high school students".

I shall conclude with two more quotations from Professor Shorey's paper. One (304-305) has to do with a paper which I was fortunate enough to hear. I thank Professor Shorey for his comments on the paper:

The address of (the then) Vice-President Coolidge at the University of Pennsylvania, July 7, 1921, has naturally attracted much attention.... President Coolidge enumerates in brief, clear-cut sentences the chief positive reasons why the modern world still needs the special discipline and culture of the classics. And as was natural in an American statesman he points out that American intellectual leadership and American idealism have, as a matter of fact, in the past drawn their inspiration largely from Greece and Rome. "And those who believe in America...will seek to perpetuate them by perpetuating the education which has produced them."

On page 306 one finds the following words:

Very different is the eloquent and sensible address... on "The Classics and the Plain Man," by Stanley Baldwin. He touches first on the part of Rome in English and modern civilization, and then stresses chiefly "the perennial happiness I am fortunate enough to find in the sheer beauty of Latin and Greek". There are some professional classicists who need to be reminded of this, the chief, though the least communicable to the general public, of the many reasons for studying the Classics.

In the concluding words, "the chief...classics", lies, to me, much of the tragedy (I use the word tragedy deliberately) of the whole discussion of the value of the Classics, of the value of liberal studies in general. Those who are most in need of the values that the study of the Classics, rightly pursued, by the right person can so richly bestow are by temperament or by education (or lack of education), or by both, least fitted to understand the arguments which such a champion of the Classics as Professor Shorey puts forth.

Since this paper is likely to be my last considerable reference to the subject of the value of the study of

Latin and Greek, I shall permit myself to quote something I wrote in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.148 (March 19, 1923):

...The Latinist has been unwilling to accept the dicta of the educator and the psychologist, on the ground that the latter know little or nothing about the subject-matter of Latin courses, and the educator and the psychologist have been unwilling to accept the dicta of the teachers of Latin, on the ground that the latter know nothing, technically, professionally, scientifically, concerning education. I myself believe that the teachers of Latin have been less handicapped by their real or supposed ignorance of education than the professors of education and the psychologists have been handicapped by their real or supposed ignorance of Latin, and of the way in which it has been, or is being, taught by the really capable teachers of the subject.

Nothing that has occurred since those words were written leads me to modify in any way the thought there expressed. I might add that it is, to my way of thinking, vastly easier to acquire a competent knowledge of education (as that term is used by the professors of education) than it is to acquire a competent knowledge of Latin alone, or of Greek alone.

CHARLES KNAPP

REVIEWS

The Classics and Our Twentieth-Century Poets.

By Henry Rushton Fairclough. Stanford University: Stanford University Press (1927). Pp. 52. 50 cents.

Professor Fairclough's address as President of the American Philological Association in 1926, now made available to all, is of particular interest to students and teachers of Latin and Greek, for two reasons. In the first place, it recalls to our minds what is perhaps the chief reason for the study of the Classics. I say "recalls", for this reason has been too nearly forgotten in the discussions of the past generation. In the general attack on the cultivation of the mind, which has resulted in the disparaging tone used by experts in the so-called science of education when they refer to purely academic education, the defenders of the study of Latin and Greek have been too much inclined to concentrate their arguments on the utility of the study. Professor Fairclough's address reminds us that after all the supreme value of the Classics lies in the realm of ideas. If the time has come when this view is to find popular recognition, it is a hopeful sign for American civilization.

Secondly, Professor Fairclough's address reminds the teacher of another truth which he sometimes is inclined to forget, that Latin and Greek are not merely to be assimilated by the student in the unthinking hope that somehow he will profit thereby, but that they are to be effective stimuli and fertile seeds. The teacher must try to secure a response to the stimulus; he must cultivate the plant which grows from the seed. One of the best arguments for the study of Latin and Greek to-day is the *probare ambulando*. Teachers can contribute to the strength of this argument by showing very clearly that the ideas of classical antiquity, its conception of literary art, even its form and style, may have and should have a moulding influence upon the

mental life of the student and upon all the products of the mind. The teacher of the Classics needs to be also something of a prophet, inspired and illuminated by the vision of what the Classics can do for America.

One thing it has done already, Professor Fairclough declares, and, more than that, he gives evidence to prove his words. His thesis may be stated briefly as follows. The poetic movement of the present century in America owes its chief initial impetus to Whitman, whose call to find new themes of poetry in American life of the present it has heeded. But the crudeness of Whitman, when it is imitated by less original minds, produces verse than can not endure, and therefore is not literature. The inorganic and the formless, except when they are found in the work of genius, can not abide. The realities, even the great realities, in the life of to-day find adequate expression and satisfying interpretation only when they are viewed in the light of other great realities which have been the themes of noble poetry in the past. They must be illuminated with the splendor and, as it were, charged with the dynamics of that poetry if they are to be added to the stock of poetry of all ages.

Professor Fairclough's evidence that this holds true of recent American poetry is strong. He mentions more than a score of leading American poets of the present century who have been broadly educated. He cites four of the five awardees of the Pulitzer prize for poetry to College-trained poets. He gives a considerable list of College teachers whose verse ranks high. Then he marshals in formidable array many quotations from the poems of the leaders in twentieth-century poetry in America, and the views of unbiased critics, all of which tend to produce the conviction that the preeminence of these poets rests partly on their intimate acquaintance with classical literature, especially Greek poetry. The outstanding poets are Edwin Arlington Robinson, best of living American poets, as some critics think, whose poems teem with echoes of the Classics, and who unites many qualities of the Greek poets with Whitman's intense Americanism and close observation of life; Sarah Teasdale and Edna St. Vincent Millay, whose lyrics are redolent of Latin and Greek poems; H. D. (Helen Doolittle), "the most brilliant and successful representative of the imagist school", who is "enamored of Greece and all things Greek" and who "carries English poetry back to the Greeks more instinctively than any other poet who has ever written in our language"; John G. Neihardt, whom an intimate knowledge of the Greek poets has enabled to interpret more successfully in poetry the lore of the American Indians; and, finally, Robinson Jeffers, one of the most recent to attain distinction in poetry, "deeply grounded as a boy in the classic languages".

These concrete proofs should hearten the teachers of the Classics by strengthening their faith in the abiding power of classic literature, and should spur them on to strive harder towards making this power dynamic in the intellectual life of their students. The nineteenth century was the period of the grammarian. May

not the twentieth century witness an effective concentration of the teacher's effort upon fructifying and quickening interpretation?

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

Second Latin Book. By Celia Ford. New York: Henry Holt and Company (1926). Pp. vii + 389 + lxxxix.

In the main, Miss Ford's Second Latin Book displays the same characteristics that her First Latin Book shows (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 21. 167-168).

It consists of twenty-two Lessons (pages 1-132), which, according to the Preface (iii), "are planned for completion and review of inflections and syntax...", eighty-eight pages (133-221) of Latin Reading, one hundred and fifteen pages (232-346), entitled Caesar's Gallic Wars, an Appendix (347-389), two Vocabularies (i-lxxxvi), and a Subject Index (lxxxvii-lxxxix).

The so-called Lessons are interspersed with much reading matter both in Latin and in English. Probably no one of them could be covered by a class in one recitation period. In fact, one infers from the Preface that the author expects a class to spend an entire semester upon this part of the book. In most Schools, this will be impossible unless the course is so organized that three semesters can be devoted to the work now usually covered in two. It would seem to the reviewer that a teacher of Latin in New York State will be fortunate if she can find a month to devote to such work as this. In this part of the book, although some new topics are introduced (e. g. gerunds and gerundives, supines, conditional sentences, etc.), and some review topics are treated more fully than in the First Latin Book (e. g. clauses of purpose and result, indirect questions, etc.), much of the material has been taken word for word and even illustration for illustration from the more elementary book. For example, pages 1-5 of the Second Latin Book are §§ 408, 530-536, 538 of the First Latin Book, with only one slight change in the exercises, and pages 18-23 of the Second Latin Book are §§ 294, 302, 314, 321, and 541 of the First Latin Book, even to the two illustrations included. Examples of this sort of repetition could be multiplied. The reviewer wonders whether some new material would not have been more appealing to the pupil, even though he may be in desperate need of a review upon the work of the first year. Then, too, where new material has been inserted, the patchwork has not been well done. Note, for example, § 154 *Dum*-Clauses, which is new, and § 156, which has no sentences illustrating the use of *dum*. The reason for this lapse is that § 156 is § 617 of the First Latin Book, in which constructions with *dum* were not treated at all.

In this reviewer's opinion, the best features of this part of the book are the vocabulary reviews, one or more of which occur in nearly every lesson, and the sections that contain the complete syntax of the various cases (e. g. 40, on the genitive). In the former the words are arranged in alphabetical order without

meanings. Many teachers have felt the need, in a second-year Latin book, of just the sort of help that the sections on the syntax of the cases afford.

The second part of the book, entitled Latin Reading, contains Ritchie's Argonauts (133-147); De Terrarum Orbe Nationibusque Antiquitatis (149-165); De Quibusdam Rebus Romanis (167-191); Nepos's Miltiades and Hannibal (191-202); Ovid's Narcissus and Echo, Baucis and Philemon, and Phaethon (203-221), besides a few pages in English regarding Roman historians, Roman poets, and Latin poetry.

Each chapter of the Argonauts is followed by notes containing references to the first part of the book. The usefulness of these notes for the pupil is impaired by several incorrect references, which are the result, probably, of inadequate proof-reading. The other readings in this part of the book have no notes; the only help offered is the inserted translation of a few words here and there.

Second-year Latin pupils always enjoy reading the story of the Argonauts, but the second and third selections in the Latin Reading will lack interest for them. Geography is not very interesting reading even to adults, and history seems to be sufficiently emphasized in a book that contains two adaptations from Nepos and over a hundred pages on Caesar's Gallic Wars, to say nothing of the historical matter occurring at intervals in the first twenty-two Lessons. The pupil will be delighted, however, by the stories from Ovid, which are partly in prose, partly in the original hexameters.

The pages entitled Caesar's Gallic Wars contain selections from the seven books of the Commentaries, including, except for one chapter, the Regents' requirements in second-year Latin for New York state. As in the case of the Argonauts, after each chapter there are notes; after most chapters, also, there are a few English sentences, presumably for translation into Latin. The notes here, too, show inadequate proof-reading.

The Appendix and the Vocabularies follow traditional lines, except for two features of the former. One of these is the result of an attempt to summarize Roman history in a page and a half—an attempt that seems to this reviewer a sad failure; the other is the inclusion here of thirteen pages of Vocabulary Reviews which are of the same excellent character as those in the first part of the book, to which reference has already been made.

Miss Ford has followed the precedent set by her First Latin Book by including in this book ugly illustrations. As has been already suggested, some of them have been taken bodily from the former book. Among the new illustrations, however, this reviewer feels most grief at the travesty of Michelangelo's beautiful Delphic Sibyl (on page 192).

Besides the map of the frontispiece, which is the same as that in the First Latin Book, there are a few others included in that part of the book which is devoted to the Gallic Wars.

TEACHERS COLLEGE,
ALBANY, NEW YORK

L. ANTOINETTE JOHNSON

Pastoral and Allegory. A Re-reading of the Bucolics of Virgil. By J. S. Phillimore. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch (1925). Pp. 32. 70 cents.

A "Re-reading" of the Eclogues of Vergil by the late Professor Phillimore, of the University of Glasgow, would seem to merit consideration, for we should expect a large amount of poetic insight in one who so well translated Propertius.

The purpose of Professor Phillimore's paper is stated on page four: "by various approaches to gain a position giving us better observation over the *Bucolics*, in the hope that their *raison d'être* and their unity may appear".

Part I (4-10) deals with the origins of pastoral poetry. Vergil should not be reproached with lack of originality. The Vergilian Bucolic (8) is "of difficult, you might almost say of precarious, achievement", like the composition of a good opera or fable. In fact, Vergil, according to Professor Phillimore, came near originating a new literary form, the pastoral allegory.

In Part II (10-13) Vergil's own alleged claim to originality (Eclogues 6.1) is discussed. Professor Phillimore interprets *Prima . . . nostra . . . Thalia* as 'My earliest muse'; he takes Vergil's whole meaning to be that "In his *Bucolics* she *deigned* to break a convention of dignity (and snobbery) and 'did not blush to lodge in the bush' . . ."

In this connection I should like to note that Vergil's claim here is strikingly like that of Manilius (2.41-42) in reference to Theocritus (I give Professor Garrod's text):

nec silvis silvestre canit perque horrida motus
rura serit dulcis musamque inducit in arva.

The muse, in Professor Phillimore's phrase, "stoops to conquer". Manilius's purpose in introducing Theocritus in company with *didactic* poets (see Professor Garrod's note) is not clear unless, keeping the manuscripts' reading *in auras* in the last line, we interpret Manilius in this way: 'Theocritus was the poet of the rough woods and countryside; he was the creator of a new idealization—the muse of pastoral poetry'. Vergil, then, may be said to have brought down the *agrestis Musa* from heaven to grace his verses. The high philosophic note of the sixth Eclogue would then explain itself. I wish that the author had given us the full commentary on Eclogue 6.1 hinted at in his essay.

Taking the seventh Idyl of Theocritus as his cue, the author develops in Part III (13-20) the idea inherent in this poem. In it, we have a page of personal recollections. This type of poem, very near the Roman satire, would fall in very well with the esoteric tradition of Roman literary circles. Vergil finds himself actually in the situation of clubmate in a society of distinguished statesmen with literary leanings. These men, having in mind as a poetical subject the very consciousness of their association, directed Vergil's attention to Theocritus as a substratum for the "vague, elusive and intractable subject".

The Bucolics are, then, the personal history of the four years 42-39. Siron was at Rome until 45. We are not to accept the general conclusion that Vergil went home then. Rather he lived in places where Siron was domiciled (20).

This supposition is amplified in Part IV (21-27) of this paper. Vergil was a regular resident of Rome, as Catullus had been. The years 52-41 were the years of Vergil's *Iuvenilia*. None of the Lives says that he went back to Mantua.

The Eclogues, then, we are to conclude (27-32), are not merely poems addressed by Vergil to Octavian, Pollio, etc., but poems of Octavian, Pollio, etc., having personality for their essence. Accordingly we must allow a larger part to allegory than we have been accustomed to allow. Menalcas is certainly Vergil. Mopsus, in Eclogue 5, is certainly Aemilius Macer. Both these equations are supported by the Berne Scholia. So we may have the characteristics of Macer in the fifth Eclogue as we have those of Pollio in the fourth Eclogue. For the most part, however, the key to Vergil's humor¹ is lost (compare Eclogues 3.95). Though the scholia, mere abridgements that they are, conflict in interpretation, as in the fifth Eclogue (Daphnis = Caesar, or Flaccus?), the literary identifications of the scholia have nothing fabulous about them. They are survivals of the "biographia litteraria" which began in Vergil's lifetime.

The arguments presented in this paper in support of an allegorical interpretation of these poems carry a certain conviction, especially when they are read in the light of recent biographical studies of the elusive poet of the Eclogues. When we shall have in our hands a definitive edition of the scholia of Philargyrius at the hands of Professor Funaioli of Palermo (promised for 1930), we shall have, I think, a little more respect for a tradition which must have gone back to Vergil's time.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

J. J. SAVAGE

<The references in Professor Phillimore's paper to Vergil's humor in the Eclogues are, to me, highly significant. After writing (9) to the effect that Vergil's critics allow that he has made "his verse very musical or very majestic", that he has exerted "all his powers of verbal picturesqueness", that he has availed "himself of all sorts of enrichment by recollection and association", Professor Phillimore continues thus: "But this is not all: if he can and if he dare, let him venture that supreme bravura of winking at the audience, as who should say 'Of course it's all one great lie, but what sport we are having with it!' To do that and yet not to break the charm is a mastery given to few. Samuel Butler caught Homer winking and liked her for it. I think Virgil winks at his audience, and that this is partly what Horace meant when he spoke [Sermones 1.10.44] of Virgil's 'divine privilege of humour combined with tenderness' in the Bucolics. *Molle atque facetum*. Our Victorian ancestors did not wink back. They painfully minimize that *facetum*. For a poet, registered as 'serious', to be caught winking was like the unpardonable sin, the sin of contempt of court, to be punished by twenty years' confinement in a German category".

I find this quotation, which is given exactly, intensely interesting, because it brings confirmation, from a wholly independent source, supplied by a scholar who shows no knowledge at all of work of mine, of my discussion of Horace's words, in an article entitled *Molle Atque Facetum*, The American Journal of Philology 38 (1917), 194-199. In that article I refused, *in toto*, to accept certain learned, but, as it seemed to me, quite misguided attempts to interpret Horace's words, and explained them (or, to be precise, *facetum*) in their only natural sense, as referring to wit, humor, pleasantries, quips, and quirks. To keep myself, so far as possible, in the realm of the objective, I cited in support of my view the words of others who, without having, save in one instance, Horace's words in mind, had found in Eclogues, Georgics, and even in the Aeneid itself evidences of a temper to which, in 35 B.C. or earlier, when Vergil had as yet produced only the Eclogues and the Georgics of his major works, Horace, or any one else, might rightly apply the term *facetum*. C. K.>

First Latin with Collateral Reading. By Victor E. François. Boston and New York: Allyn and Bacon (1926). Pp. xxvi + 454 + 69.

The aims of Professor François's book, First Latin With Collateral Reading, as expressed by the author in the Preface (iii), are four.

...The first aim is to supply an unusual amount of simple Latin reading. The second is to offer collateral reading in English. The third is to illustrate both words and principles by pictures and drawings. The fourth is to treat one topic at a time, fully applying it.

In the main it seems to this reviewer that these aims have been well accomplished. To be sure, some of the Latin reading lacks simplicity, some of the collateral reading lacks interest for a thirteen-year-old, and sometimes more than one topic is treated in a lesson, but, after all, while we are waiting for the perfect text-book in beginning Latin, this will not be a bad substitute for it. There is, at least, one consoling fact about this book. It contains so much and so varied material that the teacher can select that which best fits his own class. He will not be forced to supplement what is found here.

First Latin consists of an Introduction of about twelve pages, Lessons to the number of sixty-five, (1-413) additional Reading Lessons covering about twenty pages, and the usual Appendix and Vocabularies.

The Introduction introduces us to Galba, a Roman boy, and his difficulties in learning English contrasted with the ease (?) with which an American boy can learn Latin. It contains sections upon pronunciation, accent, quantity, and syllabication, besides some general material dealing with inflection. This Introduction seems to this reviewer to be the most interesting treatment of these innately dull topics ever seen in an elementary Latin text-book.

The Lessons contain a great variety of material and are each too long to be covered in a recitation period. However, the author did not intend that they should be (iv), but rather that each teacher should make his own allotment of the work. To this end, the material is so arranged that it admits of various divisions and omissions. Usually a so-called Lesson consists of the development of a new topic, a Latin vocabulary containing related English words (and not too long!), oral and written exercises of great variety, a reading lesson of connected Latin prose, and a section of collateral reading in English.

In general, the topics covered are those of the modern text-books for first-year Latin pupils. The subjunctive mode is omitted, as is also the future perfect tense of the indicative, and the ablative absolute is covered only by a footnote (315). The several declensions and conjugations are developed very slowly. For example, the development of the singular of the first declension extends from Lesson I through Lesson V—only one case-form is given in each lesson. Beginning with Lesson III and extending through Lesson VIII appears the development of the present tense of the first conjugation. It might be noted also here that a feature of the book is the emphasis put upon the conjugation of the verb with appropriate object or phrase, e. g. *Sum in Italia*,

es in Italia, etc. (36), and *Poetam laudo, poetam laudas*, etc. (43). The use of the various cases is taught simply and briefly, and the emphasis is at all times upon functional syntax.

As stated above, the exercises are of great variety. One needs to give the book only a cursory examination to realize their number and ingenuity. Perhaps the most outstanding feature of this part of the book is the inclusion of many completion exercises and of many sentences in which singular nouns are to be replaced by plurals, or vice versa, verbs are to be changed in tense or in voice, or pronouns are to be changed in number or in gender, the rest of the sentence being altered to correspond.

A further provision for drill is offered in the frequent Reviews. A Review occurs about every sixth Lesson. The Review Lessons contain about the same subdivisions as do the other Lessons and are characterized by their careful classification of review forms and by their emphasis upon the learning of vocabulary.

English derivation is duly emphasized, but is not over-emphasized. As was mentioned above, each Latin vocabulary contains related English words and the Review Lessons provide for the pupil's learning the meaning of the more important of these derivatives. Provision is also made for the keeping of a "Derivation Note Book" (178); from time to time definite directions are given to the pupil concerning the material to be placed therein.

The Reading Lessons are interesting and of great variety. We find here such titles as *Roma et Italia* (32); *Muscae et Lucerna* (54); *Iocus Romanus* (157); *Virtus Leonidae* (232); *Horatii et Curiatii* (323); *Virginia* (407). In addition to such stories as these, there are a few dialogues, and occasionally there are Latin questions based upon a story, or suggestions are given for dramatizing a story.

Following the suggestions of the Report of the Classical Investigation the author has put into nearly every Lesson in this book collateral reading in English. These readings vary in length from less than a half-page to about one and a half pages, and are mostly quoted from West's *Early Progress*. Among the topics treated are Roman Children's Garments (5); Roman Houses (47, 54); The Roman Army (93); Publius Vergilius Maro (101); Caesar in Gaul (198); Pompeian Rooms (299); The Tiber (364). In general, these readings are well-chosen, but some of them seem rather difficult and without much interest for the ordinary child in the first year of the High School. As an example of this might be mentioned The Gracchi (333); here there is some discussion of agrarian reforms. The author would have done better, too, had he rewritten some of this quoted material. On one page (334) of the Gracchi, there are nine apparent omissions from the original text, which result in a very abrupt, 'choppy' English style. In some instances, too,

the sequence of these readings could be improved. It does not seem a very good arrangement of material concerning the Punic Wars to find it on pages 75, 144, 241, and 370.

The additional Reading Lessons (415-435) bear the title *Historia Romana*, and comprise a simple epitome of Roman history from the time of the earliest kings down through the Battle of Actium. According to a footnote (415), they are designed to be read at any time after the pupil has reached Lesson LI.

First Latin is copiously illustrated and, as the Preface states (iv), the illustrations bear more directly upon the subject-matter than is usual in a beginner's book. As examples of proper motivation, we note the Reading Lesson, *Ranae et Iuppiter* (248) and the picture of Jupiter (249), a piece of Collateral Reading, Writing Material (249-251), and a copy of the Pompeian wall-painting representing a girl with tablet and stylus (250).

STATE TEACHER'S COLLEGE,
ALBANY, NEW YORK

L. ANTOINETTE JOHNSON

First Latin. By Victor E. François. Boston and New York: Allyn and Bacon (1926) Pp. xxvi + 343 + 69.

This book is a briefer edition of the book reviewed above, *First Latin With Collateral Reading*.

The collateral readings in English have been omitted, as have about a third of the illustrations. In the exercises, there are omissions and condensations. With these exceptions, the volume contains the same material as the longer book.

STATE TEACHER'S COLLEGE,
ALBANY, NEW YORK

L. ANTOINETTE JOHNSON

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 193rd meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held at the Princeton Club on Friday, November 4, 1927. Thirty-two members were present. In the paper of the evening, The Four Phaedras, Mr. Francis J. Raska, of the Central High School, discussed the character of Phaedra as drawn by Euripides, Seneca, Molière, and d'Annunzio.

The 197th meeting was held at the Princeton Club, on Friday, March 2. Forty-six members and guests were present. Professor John C. Rolfe discussed Hadrian's Wall in Britain. He dealt with the history and the purpose of the wall, the allusions to it in Latin writers, its present appearance, and the results of excavations along the line of the wall. The paper was illustrated by lantern-slides.

B. W. MITCHELL, Secretary-Treasurer

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States will be held at Princeton University, on Friday and Saturday, May 18-19 next.